

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 24, 2005. Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 15 and 17 to 23 are pending in the application, with Claims 4 and 16 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 7 to 14, 19 and 21 to 23 have been amended. Claims 1, 12, and 21 to 23 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Turning first to a formal matter, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to acknowledge receipt of the Japanese priority applications filed in this case on January 16, 2002.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 15 and 17 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) over U.S. Patent No. 6,044,398 (Marullo); and Claims 4 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Marullo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,321 (Burrett). Claims 4 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter and without conceding the correctness of their rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a remote-operating apparatus for remotely operating a first apparatus in a network protected by a firewall from outside of the firewall. The apparatus includes a reception device configured to receive predetermined information from the first apparatus, and a determination device configured to determine operation information for remotely operating the first apparatus based on the received predetermined information. The apparatus also includes a transmission device configured to transmit the operation

information to the first apparatus as a response to the predetermined information received by the reception device.

Independent Claim 22 as amended is a method claim which is seen to generally correspond to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 21 as amended is directed to a method of remotely operating a first apparatus in a network protected by a firewall using a remote-operating apparatus from outside the firewall. The method includes the steps of transmitting predetermined information from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus, and determining operation information for remotely operating the first apparatus based on the predetermined information. The method also includes the step of transmitting the operation information from the remote-operating apparatus to the first apparatus as a response to the predetermined information.

A feature of the invention of Claims 1, 21 and 22 therefore lies in determining operation information for remotely operating a first apparatus in a network protected by a firewall from a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall, wherein the operation information is determined based on predetermined information transmitted from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus. The applied references of Marullo and Barrett are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Marullo is seen to disclose an Internet website virtual browser application that exercises and verifies web server applications and scripts by simulating a web browser to request, capture, store, and verify data returned from web servers, by discarding data not critical to testing, and by saving and reusing retained data for subsequent transactions. See Marullo, column 4, lines 49 to 54; and Abstract.

Although Marullo may be seen to disclose an application for simulating web browser requests and verifying data returned from web servers, it is not seen to disclose or suggest that operation information is determined for remotely operating a first apparatus from a remote-operating apparatus, muchless that such determination of the operation information is based on predetermined information transmitted from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus. In addition, Marullo is not seen to disclose or suggest that the first apparatus is in a network protected by a firewall, and that the remote-operating apparatus is outside of the firewall. Accordingly, Marullo is not seen to disclose or suggest determining operation information for remotely operating a first apparatus in a network protected by a firewall from a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall, wherein the operation information is determined based on predetermined information transmitted from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus.

In its rejection of now-cancelled Claim 4, the Office Action cited to Barrett for its alleged disclosure of an apparatus connected to a network protected by a firewall. Although Barrett may be seen to disclose a client computer within a network protected by a user-configurable firewall, it is not seen to disclose or suggest that operation information is determined for remotely operating a first apparatus from a remote-operating apparatus. Moreover, Barrett is not seen to disclose or suggest that such operation information is determined based on predetermined information transmitted from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus. Accordingly, Barrett is not seen to disclose or suggest determining operation information for remotely operating a first apparatus in a network protected by a firewall from a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall, wherein

the operation information is determined based on predetermined information transmitted from the first apparatus to the remote-operating apparatus.

Allowance of Claims 1, 21 and 22 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 12 as amended is directed to an information processing apparatus in a network protected by a firewall. The apparatus includes transmission means for transmitting predetermined information, upon which operation information for remotely operating the information processing apparatus is based, to a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall. The apparatus also includes reception means for receiving the operation information transmitted from the remote-operating apparatus as a response to the predetermined information, and control means for performing control based on the operation information received by the reception means.

Independent Claim 23 as amended is a method claim which is seen to generally correspond to Claim 12.

A feature of the invention of Claims 12 and 23 therefore lies in transmitting predetermined information from an information processing apparatus in a network protected by a firewall to a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall, wherein operation information for remotely operating the information processing apparatus is based on the predetermined information. The applied references of Marullo and Barrett are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As noted above, Marullo is seen to disclose an application for simulating web browser requests and verifying data returned from web servers. However, Marullo is not seen to disclose or suggest the transmission of predetermined information from an information processing apparatus in a network protected by a firewall to a remote-operating

apparatus outside of the firewall. Moreover, Marullo is not seen to disclose or suggest that operation information for remotely operating the information processing apparatus is based on the predetermined information.

In addition, Barrett has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Marullo. In particular, although Barrett may be seen to disclose a user-configurable firewall, it is not seen to disclose or suggest transmitting predetermined information from an information processing apparatus in a network protected by a firewall to a remote-operating apparatus outside of the firewall, wherein operation information for remotely operating the information processing apparatus is based on the predetermined information.

Allowance of Claims 12 and 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 12, and 21 to 23 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 98106v1